

I thought at the time the percentage was raised that the FCC's Chairman's recommendation allowing any particular media entity to control a greater and greater portion of any market was a disservice to the consumer (we the people) and a danger to our democracy. Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of this danger and proof that media consolidation is not in the public interest.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter. No affiliate should be forced to air any particular, specific program, especially of this nature in a blatant effort to manipulate the election.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. It's time to lower the percentage of any market that a new/media company can own. It is essential to our democratic republic. Otherwise what we are moving toward, whether anyone acknowledges it or not, is corporate fascism. We've already fought one war against that form of government. Thank you.